

REMARKS

In paragraph 3 of the final Action, the drawings were objected to. In view of the objection, Fig. 5 has been amended. An annotated sheet and a replacement sheet are attached herewith.

In paragraph 5 of the final Action, claims 3-5 and 8-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. In paragraph 7 of the final Action, claims 3, 4 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Heredia. In paragraph 9 of the final Action, claims 5, 8 and 10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Heredia in view of Nagasawa.

In view of the rejections, a personal interview has been made on January 20, 2010, and discussed the 112 rejection and the prior art rejections.

As a result of the interview, it was agreed to amend claim 3, as shown in the amendment attached herewith. The amendment will clarify the recitation of claim 3 and overcome the 112 rejection.

In regard to the prior art rejections, Heredia at column 7, lines 44-55 was referred to, wherein it is explained that each of the networked player software is capable of acting as the server does in the referred embodiment, and that all player data can flow through one players game program.

If all player data flows through one player game program, the game program installed in the one player operates as in the server, and all the data including the communications among the players has to pass through the game program in said one player. Thus, although the server is not used, the system operates as using the server.

In paragraph 7, lines 54-55 of Heredia, it is also stated that each player program will individually transmit data to all players. In this case, if all the players operate the game contradict to each other, the game does not operate, so that some control system must be installed. Also, in this case, since the game does not use

the server, the game does not constitute the invention, because, in the invention, the server is required. Therefore, Heredia does not disclose or suggest the features of the invention.

The Examiner's comment stating that "The examiner agreed to withdraw the 102 rejection and if there is no problem after the amendment to allow the case" is noted with appreciation.


The Examiner's suggestion and opinion at the interview are appreciated.

Two month extension of time is hereby requested. A credit card authorization form in the amount of \$245.00 is attached herewith for the two month extension of time.

If further amendment is necessary, please contact the undersigned agent.

Respectfully Submitted,

KANESAKA BERNER & PARTNERS

By 
Manabu Kanesaka
Reg. No. 31,467
Agent for Applicants

1700 Diagonal Road, Suite 310
Alexandria, VA 22314
(703) 519-9785